DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 748 EC 060 609

AUTHOR Hughes, Stephen G.
TITLE Student Residence Hall Life: A Review of Literature, Research, and Experience Pertinent to Planning Residence-Based Programs for Post-Secondary Deaf and Hearing Students.
INSTITUTION National Technical Inst. for the Deaf, Rochester, N. Y.
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Aurally Handicapped; College Students; *Exceptional Child Education; Identification (Psychological); Peer Relationship; *Research Reviews (Publications); *Residential Programs; Residential Schools; Staff Role; Student Behavior; Student School Relationship; Technical Education; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *National Technical Institute for the Deaf

ABSTRACT

Reviewed in the paper are studies on college and university living, facts and proposals from persons cognizant of residential living, and information about present residential accommodations of students at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID). The aim of the paper is given to be collecting previously unknown data about housing of deaf students before NTID residential facilities are completed. Students in residence halls are said to engage in self selection of peers and to exhibit seemingly inappropriate changes of life style in their search for identity. It is maintained that manipulative procedures, such as having a residence hall serve in loco parentis, have been only moderately effective and tend to inhibit the self deterministic peer process. Residence hall potential for reducing student isolation is said to depend on the hall's capacity to encompass formal and informal activities of students and to provide staff that function as a common ground between the institution and student needs. The residence hall is seen as realistically contributing to the peer process and to educational goals when it is based on the living learning center concept. The concept is discussed in terms of integration of all activities and assimilation of deaf and hearing students into a common peer culture through the use of trained student personnel as staff members. Questions related to student life in residence halls based on the concept revolve around the extent of academic input required, an arrangement between the residence hall and the physical education department to provide recreational and competitive activities, and a reallocation of professional and administrative responsibilities. (MC)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 084748

Vol. I

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STUDENT RESIDENCE HALL LIFE: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE, RESEARCH, AND EXPERIENCE PERTINENT TO PLANNING RESIDENCE-BASED PROGRAMS FOR POST-SECONDARY DEAF AND HEARING STUDENTS

by

Stephen G. Hughes
Research Assistant
Division of Developmental Education

National Technical Institute for the Deaf
Rochester Institute of Technology

June, 1973

EC 060 609

INTRODUCTION

In just a few years, the student population of NTID will have expanded from an initial 70 to the intended full enrollment of 750 full-time deaf students and about 50 full-time equivalent interns or trainees. The residential facilities presently under construction to accommodate this student body represent, like the whole of NTID, an entirely unique opportunity to meet the great needs of higher education for the deaf in this country. Insofar as NTID has no real precedent, information about the housing of deaf college students in a predominantly hearing environment is practically non-existent. This paper is an attempt to help remedy that deficiency by correlating and summarizing three bodies of information: 1) available literature about college and university residential living; 2) facts and proposals gathered from persons experienced in the relevant areas of concern; and 3) information about the present residential accommodations for NTID students.

The information gathered from the above sources is organized into four related topics. "Residence hall impact" describes the way a college residential environment may affect students' lives. "Deaf-hearing interaction" describes the general outlines of a deaf-hearing environment as it might occur in a residence hall. "Residence hall staffing" deals with possible ways of implementing an appropriate residential environment through staff functions. "Physical facilities" briefly discusses the possible effects on students of the physical structure of a residential environment.

In the course of bringing together information on residence halls, certain documents and a number of proposals for residential facilities and programs emerged as particularly relevant. These have been included as appendices. (Vol. II)

Although I am indebted to a great many people in NTID for the support and assistance they have given me in bringing this report together, any faults in fact or error are entirely my own. I am especially grateful to Dr. Youst for his direction and criticism. Sue Weegar has generously contributed her time to much of the research and has kindly allowed the inclusion of her thesis in the appendix.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I

	Page
INTRODUCTION	i
RESIDENCE HALL IMPACT	1
Manipulation of Peer Group Influences Homogeneous Groups Co-educational Groups Compatible Roommates	1
Directing Student Life	8
Discussion	11
DEAF-HEARING INTERACTION	13
Discrimination	13
Confrontation	17
Assimilation	24
Discussion	25
RESIDENCE HALL STAFF	29
The Changing Role of the Staff	29
Student Personnel	30
Meeting Student Needs	33
PHYSICAL FACILITIES	36
SUMMARY DISCUSSION	39
Student Life in the Residence Hall	39
The Residence Hall in Student Life	41
Developing Student Residence Hall Life	43
REFERENCES	46

Volume II

APPENDICES

Interviews

Documents

A Program in Employability Orientation
Outline of Residence Hall Research Project
A Training Program for Student Personnel

Proposals

RESIDENCE HALL IMPACT

During the last decade the critical role of residence hall life in determining the success of a student's college experience has come to be widely recognized. As Chickering describes it (1969):

> Residence Hall arrangements either foster or inhibit development of competence, purpose, integrity, and freeing interpersonal relationships, depending on the diversity of backgrounds and attitudes among the residents, the opportunities for significant exchange, the existence of shared intellectual interests, and the degree to which the unit becomes a meaningful culture for its members. (157)

The extent to which the residence hall can influence student growth derives from the now well-documented fact that a residential environment functions in much the same way as a community to constrain and direct the attitudes and behavior of resident-members (Katz, 1968; Chickering, 1969; Newcomb and Feldman, 1969).

The influence of a residential community is brought about by 1) the pressures exerted through informal subcultures or peer groups that develop out of the affinities and needs that certain members have for one another and the group, and 2) the impact of formal and informal structured activities and programs in the residence hall.

Manipulation of Peer Group Influences

It is often contended that students learn as much from their peers in college as they do in the formal educational environment. Because the

principle vehicle of inter-student influence is the peer group (Sanford, 1962; Hartshoren, 1963; Wilson, 1966; Whittaker, 1969), many experimental efforts have been directed at determining whether peer groups can be structured or their influences manipulated to effect certain behavioral and educational goals.

At its simplest, a peer group may be defined as "any set of two or more students whose relationships to one another are such as to exert an influence upon them as individuals" (Newcomb, 1967, p. 469). The two general conditions which are thought to lead to the probable formation of student peer groups are: 1) propinquity, and 2) similarities of backgrounds, attitudes, and interests (Maissoneuve and Palmade, 1962; Warr, 1964; Newcomb, 1967). Attempts to manipulate peer group influences have been mainly concerned with bringing together groups of students having similar attitudes and interests, probably because the personal background of any given student is too difficult to accurately delineate and hence control. On the whole, the results of such experimentation have not been entirely consistent or conclusive.

Homogeneous Groups

DeCoster (1966, 1968) twice tested groups of high academic ability students. When comparing them to randomly assigned student groups he found that the high-ability students displayed greater academic achievement and overall satisfaction with their college experience. He also found that randomly distributed high-ability students seemed to have a positive effect on the academic achievement of the lower-achievement

students with whom they were grouped. Astin (1963), however, in a somewhat more comprehensive test of high-ability students randomly sampled from 76 colleges and universities, concluded that "continued exposure to a peer group of unusually high intelligence has a detrimental effect on the self-confidence and ambition of students" whether they are high or low ability students (p. 224).

A number of experiments with groups of students having the same academic or vocational interests has been conducted with only slightly more promising results (Davison, 1965; Elton and Bate, 1966; Morishima, 1966). Such groups did not appear to positively influence the academic achievement of their members, although a certain increase in academic interests or "Scholarly Orientation" was noted. Brown (1968) has provided one of the more recent and authoritative statements about the effect of grouping students of like academic interests in a residence hall. Two dormitory floors were populated with 55 students each in a one-to-four ratio of Humanities-to-Science students. Two more floors of 55 students each were populated with the opposite ratio of Humanities-to-Science students. The students were pretested on Thinking Introversion and Theoretical Orientation Scales and several sociometric questionnaires. It was determined that "propinquity and similarity of academic-vocational goals were important factors in determining friendship patterns" (p. 556). (Brown's conclusions regarding the differences in attitudes, interests, and personalities of students in different academic-vocational groups had been previously documented by Teeban, 1954; Sternberg, 1955; and Holland, 1965.) After testing the students on the Omnibus Personality

Inventory, Brown concluded that "the dominance of a vocational group had significant impact on the feelings about college major, satisfaction with college and social interaction".

Although the effect of homogeneous interest grouping upon similar vocational-academically oriented students tested by Brown seems to be established, it is questionable whether propinquity is a key variable in this effect. Huntley (1965) conducted a four year longitudinal test of 1,027 students at Union College (who were not necessarily living together) and discovered that the personality traits which characterized initial entrance into a major tended to be reinforced and become more homogeneous over time as the students remained in their chosen fields.

The effect of segregating freshmen from other undergraduates has been found to be positive in terms of personal and social growth but not measurable in terms of academic achievement (Beal and Williams, 1968; Schoemer and McConnell, 1970). The evidence supporting the desirability of freshman housing derives less from specific tests of freshman - upperclassman segregation than it does from the available information concerning the kind of differences which exist between freshmen and other undergraduates in college. One of the most significant, accelerated, and perhaps difficult periods of change and adjustment for a college student occurs during the first few weeks or months of his college career (Lehman, 1962; Wallace, 1966; Centra, 1969). Given this and the fact that entering freshmen tend to have a more positive and receptive attitude toward college than do older students (Stern, 1966; Gordon,

1967; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969) freshman housing might provide a unique opportunity to give incoming students supportive direction and a strong positive impetus in their college career through special orientation and exposure to role models.

Co-educational Groups

A number of articles have appeared recently evaluating various co-educational efforts (Gerst and Moos, 1961; Greenleaf, 1962; Schroeder and Lemay, 1963; Corbette and Sommer, 1972; Brown, Winkworth and Baskamp, 1973). Co-educational housing is still a relatively novel effort, and the present lack of sophisticated evaluation is compounded by the probable difficulty of obtaining reliable responses on tests dealing with sex-related attitudes or behavior. It is worth noting that the concensus of opinion, impressionistic though it may be, is that mixed-sex residential environments are conducive to a more relaxed, stable, and perhaps mature student life-style.

Compatible Roommates

Because of the interest of some universities in expediting roomate compatibility, several experiments have tried to distinguish the significant variables and interaction effects of various kinds of compatible roommate relationships (Hall and Willerman, 1963; Crew and Giblette, 1969; Pace, 1970). Most of these tests, however, focused on only one or two variables as predicting roommate compatibility. Gehring (1970) has pointed out the complexity and virtual impossibility of predicting roommate compatibility with replicable success, and showed that

roommates with a host of similar characteristic variables (academic, sociometric, personal) were no more or less compatible than roommates with dissimilar variables.

On the whole, the best general conclusion that could be drawn from the literature treating the manipulation of residence hall environments is that, all things being equal, the grouping together of students of like characteristics or needs can have a measurable effect on the course of their development. More specifically, there is some evidence that homogeneous "major" housing, co-educational housing, and freshman housing might have a positive effect on the college experiences of the students involved.

The ambiguity of these conclusions can be generally ascribed to the relative novelty of studies of residence hall environments and hence the unsophisticated state-of-the-art. In much the same way that the developmental theories concerned with student life often neglect to distinguish between the effects of sociological and psychological interests or influences (Feldman, 1969), the literature dealing with residence hall impact often fails to distinguish between the effects of peer group influence and the effects of the implied interest group influence. Student change in a peer group is attributable to the press of group interests on the student -- although he may not have brought this set of interests to the group or previously subscribed to all of them. Student development in an interest group derives from the effects of the students' singular commitment (as opposed to group involvement) to a definable set of

interests such as science or the humanities (Huntley, 1965; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969). This failure to distinguish between peer and interest group influence relates to the more basic failure to factor out the effects of mere propinquity in the multivariate study of group activities and life. Even when peer associations or housing assignments are random, unintended, and even undesirable, the mere fact of living together has a measureable effect on the attitudes and activities of students in a residential setting (Seigle and Seigle, 1957; Severinsen, 1970).

This latter finding points to a general oversight which can help explain the prevailing inconsistencies among generally single-criterion tests of peer influence as well as the greater student satisfaction with college experience noted in most of the peer group studies. The principal variable in positive and effective peer group interaction is probably self-selection. Non-manipulative studies of peer groups (Homans, 1950; Lofland, 1969) deal with groups of persons who have chosen to act together. A contrived or assigned peer group lacks this element and the influence of the group on the members thus will depend upon the extent of de facto self-selection. Vreeland (1965), in a comprehensive study of Harvard "houses" found that student attitudinal development was related more to their involvement with academic or personal activities than to their "house" involvements. The students involved simply chose their group affinities elsewhere than in the residential context.

Directing Student Life

If it can be accepted that self-selection in the absence of strong compulsion is a most important principle of effective peer group formation and influence, then residence halls programs might more properly be seen as facilitating the process of self-selection and capitalizing on it when it does occur. Viewed as such, the residence hall should first provide an appropriate and stimulating atmosphere for the formation of student peer groups, and should then attempt to direct these groups toward desirable attitudes and activities.

As such, residence hall impact would facilitate and compliment rather than implement, the student's learning experiences.

One of the most obvious ways to augment the student's experiences in the residence hall is to establish programs which complement classroom activities. Brown (1968) conducted what was probably one of the better documented attempts at programming residents' life. A "discussion program" was established on several science and humanities dominated floors, while several other similar floors went without the program. Using the Omnibus Personality Inventory and several questionnaires in a pre-posttest format, Brown determined that the effect of the program was to reinforce the existing patterns of activities and ideas. Interestingly enough, there was no attempt to determine the effect of the discussion program on academic achievement. Taylor (1970) did attempt to measure the effect of a residence program of homogeneous housing and tutoring on freshmen and found that, compared to non-program residents, the students involved had a significantly higher cumulative achievement.

The literature appears to emphasize that there is no a priori quarantee that an enrichment program will contribute to the quality of the student's college experience. Chickering (1970) in a two-year longitudinal study at seven colleges, found that changes in the cultural sophistication of students was attributable to college climate, student traits, peer group relationships, educational practices, and student-faculty relationships; but that it was not measurably affected by involvement in aesthetic or literary extracurricular activities.

Based on the literature surveyed it seems reasonable to suggest that the quality and appropriateness of any co-curricular activity or program will determine its degree of effectiveness. A case in point is the evidence concerning student-faculty relationships. Several attempts have been made to determine the effect of degrees of student-faculty contact on student attitudes and academic achievement in the context of a program or series of controlled circumstances. The appropriateness to the kind of student involved (Meyer, 1965; Feinberg, 1972) and the quality of the contact (Newcomb, 1967; Alberti, 1972) determined effectiveness of contact in the studies noted. In each case, the frequency of contact did not result in significant differences.

The most comprehensive proposals for providing appropriate residential environments and effective co-curricular programs have appeared in the literature dealing with the idea of the residence hall as a "living-learning center" (Clarcq, 1967, 1970; Riker, 1965, 1969). As Riker (1969) describes it, college housing should serve as an integral part

of the educational effort, and as such "the educational function of college housing is to help students grow as human beings" (5). Specifically, "the residence hall should be utilized as a means for providing opportunities that will enable students to act out, question, and apply concepts developed via the formal academic encounter" (Clarcq, 1970, p. 44).

The concept of residence halls serving as living-learning centers has been implemented and evaluated in a number of instances in recent years (Astin, 1967, 1970; Centra, 1967, 1968; Pemberton, 1968; Rockey, 1969; Riker, 1969; Ladd, 1970; Dressel, 1971; Shaw, 1972; Student Housing, 1972). The schools in which reported living-learning programs were implemented included Michigan State University, Wesleyan University, Yale, Toronto University, Stephens College, Indiana University, Hampshire College, Duke University, UCLA, University of Denver, Cornell University, University of Michigan, and the University of Nebraska. These programs generally entailed the establishment of a student group devoted to serving particular interests or academic purposes in a residence hall. This space was provided with the relevant facilities, and co-curricular (and sometimes regular curricular) activities were developed. These attempts at unifying the college experiences of students by either centering them in the residence or by having residence hall life closely complement the curricular life have met with mixed results.

It could not be said from the evidence so far that a living-learning residence hall environment will, of itself, guarantee an improvement in

the academic achievement of students. In each case, however, students were reported to have been more "stable" and satisfied with their college experiences when compared to students in different programs or in no program at all.

Discussion

On the whole, information drawn from literature and research concerning the manipulation or direction of student life in residence halls has some relevance to the concerns of NTID. The information gathered from reviewing the experiences of administrators, researchers, and residence hall staff at NTID tends to compliment several of the possibilities raised in the review of research. Some administrators and researchers and most staff agreed that freshman housing for at least the first quarter would be the only viable kind of "assigned" housing. Nearly all researchers, administrators, and staff agree that some form of co-educational housing would be desirable. Many of those interviewed suspected that similar major groups would also be a desirable residential arrangement. All persons interviewed agreed that forced associations would be detrimental, and that choice of housing assignment would facilitate the quality of residence hall life and contribute to the self reliance of students.

One of the principle limitations of the literature surveyed is the generally untested relevance to the deaf of theories about the sociometric patterns of hearing persons. The only available information about deaf residential sociometric patterns is the research conducted by Riffer at NTID during 1970 and 1971. A number of his conclusions

indicate that sociometric patterns of deaf residents are different from those of hearing residents. Riffer affirmed that propinquity was not a significant determinant of friendship patterns among the students he tested. This conclusion has been affirmed by most of the staff interviewed. Furthermore, it seems apparent that the criteria which determine the self selection of deaf peer groups differ from those of hearing peer groups. The most obvious distinctions among various students were their communication skills and perceived degree of deafness. Some deaf students who label themselves "hard-of-hearing" do not wish to be associated with other deaf students; and more frequently, there are differences among the more oral and the more manual students. These two distinctions are not necessarily coterminous. This information was also affirmed by most of the staff interviewed. Another chief determinant of deaf friendship patterns indicated by Riffer is the school background of the students: residential or day school, and hearing or deaf school background. Most of the persons interviewed were uncertain of this finding, although a few of the staff tentatively affirmed it.

The one point upon which most persons interviewed agreed, and which Riffer affirmed, was that the deaf student is extensively isolated from the world around him -- to a much greater extent than is the alienated college student described in much of the literature concerning student development (Korn, 1969). This condition of isolation seems to underlie many of the issues of student vocational-academic, personal, and social development upon which a residence hall should impact in a remedial and developmental fashion.

DEAF-HEARING INTERACTION

The isolation of the deaf may be conceived as a matrix of many of the difficulties they experience in adjusting their lives to the hearing world. This issue is often couched in the language of segregation-integration, and although these terms may in fact describe an aspect of deaf isolation, the language and topical implications of such an approach are fraught with several dangerous misconceptions. Therefore, in order to clearly present the issues involved, the terms in which this report describes deaf-hearing interactions have been carefully delineated. The information reviewed in this report suggests that there are three distinct yet related aspects of deaf-hearing interaction: 1) discrimination among deaf students and within deaf-hearing student groups; 2) confrontation among deaf students and within deaf-hearing student groups; and 3) assimilation of deaf students, of hearing students, and of deaf-hearing student groups into an appropriate context.

Discrimination

Riffer (1970a) found that discrimination between types of deaf students was as significant as the discrimination among deaf and hearing students. Initially, it would appear that the basis for such discrimination is lack of communication: except for an "oral" deaf and hearing exchange, the deaf and the hearing students often tend to remain segregated from one another; except for those deaf who practice both oral and manual communication, the oral and the more manual deaf remain somewhat socially distinct from one another. In studying deaf friendship patterns (1970b),

Riffer found that good oral speech increased the likelihood of hearing friendships among the deaf students.

Discrimination among the deaf-hearing student body according to communication skills or types may be the symptomatic indication of a more basic discriminatory activity. Nearly all persons interviewed, particularly those with more extensive contact with the NTID students, indicated that there are other variables which often serve as equally important discriminating criteria among student groups. Among these were type of family and school background, sex, race, degree of hearing loss (where this varies from communication skills type), and personality. These other criteria were also mentioned by Riffer (1970a). A closer examination of the available information indicated that attitudes (particularly the student's outlook as it relates to his personal and social development) were the basis for deaf-hearing student discrimination, and not simply communication type.

Walter (1969) indicated that "attitudes are the result of a kind of cultural fixedness toward handicapped people, and not based on direct experience with deaf individuals." A study by Rusalem (1956) indicated that "there is much misunderstanding about the deaf and blind and... only through structured interaction can attitudes be changed" (7). In a more recent study, Isaacs (1972) determined by means of five questionnaires that certain stereotypes exist among kinds of deaf students in NTID, and also between the deaf and hearing populous of RIT.

The influence of a student's school background on his friendship patterns (Riffer, 1970b, 1973) indicates the extent to which deaf-hearing interaction is initially determined by the attitudes and experiences the students bring with them. Administrators interviewed as well some research reviewed (Walter and Berdy, 1971) indicated that well over half of the students entering NTID had previous exposure to a deaf-hearing environment. Most of the staff and some of the administrators who had more extensive contact with the NTID students, indicated that there was a quite general and prevailing desire among the deaf students to "integrate" with the hearing student body. Likewise, many of the NTID students who had not identified with their handicap appear to be doing so through association with such a concentrated and large number of deaf students. This contrasts interestingly with the "cultural fixedness toward handicapped people" which presumably characterized a majority of the entering RIT hearing students. Riffer (see Appendix C) described an undercurrent of resentment among some hearing students and faculty toward NTID students.

It is important to recognize that there is both a positive and a negative aspect to the discriminating process underlying student group segregation. When students segregate themselves from the larger student body into interest or peer groups, this is a more natural and positive phenomenon than the isolation of students according to stereotype or through lack of understanding.

Zirkel (1971) has indicated with respect to ethnic group membership that, "...it may either enhance or depress the self-concept of a child" (p. 220) and he suggests that the "disadvantage" of belonging to a minority group can become a positive reinforcement of self-concept and be used as a means to enhance the "scholastic self-realization" of the individual. There appears to be a growing interest among students and staff particularly in encouraging the growth of "deaf pride."

In a more particular sense, it is probably important to the personal development of the indiviual student to maintain certain kinds of exclusive relationships. Kennedy (1972) in a study of the effects of deafness on personality, states that the "choice of a mate is the most significant occurrence at this (19 to 24 year stage", and suggests that it is common and probably desirable for the deaf to intermarry (p. 30).

Administrators, researchers, and staff all generally agree that students should be encouraged to develop their own friendships, and further suggested that initial segregation of deaf and hearing students might, in some cases, be beneficial. Riffer (1971c) suggested that, initially, "putting deaf students among hearing students may result in greater social isolation from other deaf students with no compensating increment in contact with hearing peers."

A student is probably notivated to move beyond the parameters of self-supporting groups and expands the range of his interaction to include persons less like himself through a change or development of attitude.

Many of the persons interviewed felt that an effective way to diminish the negative discrimination among students is to provide orientation and educative activities in the formal context of the residence hall, particularly for the benefit of the hearing students. There is reason to believe that by encouraging the process of self-selective peer group formation in an appropriately structured residential environment the positive aspect of interpersonal discrimination can be enhanced.

Confrontation

NTID is a physically integral part of the RIT campus and there is thus a certain "mixing" of the deaf-hearing student body which is a given condition of the academic, social, and personal life of each student. It is this informal "mixing", as well as the more intensive interaction possible in a structured environment such as the residence hall, which gives rise to the intergroup and interpersonal confrontation most characteristic of deaf-hearing interaction. It is generally true that as the numbers of a minority group increase, the elements of difference between them and the majority group will become more visible and tangible. This is basically a neutral though volatile situation, and the outcome hinges largely on the context (Katz, 1964, 1968). In the context of deaf-hearing student confrontation, attitudes are affected in such a way as to generate either a conflict or an articulate confrontation among students.

The literature dealing with integration or desegregation of minority groups offers little more of relevance than a vague promise concerning

the virtue of integration. St. John (1970) in a survey study of the effects of desegregation on the academic achievement of school children stated that the available information "suggests that in cases of desegregation of school systems or of individuals, of whatever type at whatever academic level, subjects generally perform no worse, and in most cases better" (128). Crain, (1970), in concluding a comparative evaluation of Black post-educational job histories, stated that those Blacks who attended integrated public schools, when compared to those who did not, had better jobs and a higher income during the succeeding two decades of their lives. He suggested that their advantage derived less from a superior education than it did from a significant difference in attitudes consequent upon attendance at an integrated school. Whether these attitudes contributed to their initial attendance at the integrated school is not made clear.

In contrast to the pro-integration bias which pervades much of the literature, a more qualified view of the effects of minority group educational opportunities has recently emerged in some of the more considered research efforts. Coleman (1966) amassed descriptive data from a sample of 600,000 children and 60,000 teachers in about 4000 schools concerning equality of educational opportunity. His data suggested that, given an equal educational opportunity, the educational disadvantage which minority children will experience derives from their "family background." Much of the controversy which has ensued has tended to overlook the fruitful implications of the significance of "background" or environment, and has often failed to consider the possibility that equal opportunity

may not adequately meet dissimilar needs or may simply be equally inappropriate. Katz (1967), and Stein and Zusser (1970), have variously suggested that the IQ level of the majority limits the extent of IQ gains of minority groups sharing in the educational and social experiences of the majority. Of greater significance here is the conclusion of Stein and Zusser who stated that, "Both the depressing effects of a poor social environment and a stimulating effect of a good social environment are most evident in groups at the greatest social disadvantage. The greatest deterioriation and the greatest and most substained improvements have been produced by total exposure to a new residential environment." (p. 67)

Riffer (1970b) found that over a period of time simple exposure to persons of unlike groups in the college and particularly in the residential environment tended to break down stereotypes. He found that the deaf students tended to approximate the attitudes of hearing students over a six month period. "For better or for worse ... NTID students tend to become less distinguisable from their hearing contemporaries in their attitudes about themselves and others." (Stuckless, 1971). The implication of this attitudinal change, if students do tend to like those most similar to themselves, is that an increasing similarity of attitudes among deaf and hearing students might lead to better interaction. Of equal importance, as the subgroups of deaf students tend more toward a "hearing norm", they might be less likely to discriminate among themselves.

The importance of a change or development of attitude in furthering deaf-hearing socialization is indicated in some of the literature concerning deaf psychology. Coleman (1964) stated that "...in general personality maladjustment is more common among physically disabled persons than among physically normal persons (but) there is no causal connection between the handicap and the maladjustment. It is the individual's attitudes, not the disability itself, that are the primary determinants of his mode and level of adjustment." DiFrancesca and Hurwirtz (1969), in discussing the problems of deaf employability indicated that "...it is not lack of innate functional abilities that limit our clients. They do have sufficient intelligence, motor and coordination skill and motivation to work at a competitive level. It is their deficient social and emotional functioning that stultifies achievement and precludes employment."

Craig, Newman, and Burrows, (1972) in a descriptive study of three post-secondary programs for deaf students concluded in a similar vein that school drop-outs were not due to deficient academic abilities, but rather that, "adjustment difficulties, poorly defined career goals, personal considerations, and financial difficulties are major correctable reasons for students failing to graduate." (p. 611)

Several studies conducted at NTID in recent years (Walter, 1969; Stuckless, 1972) further confirmed the fact that contact among unlike groups in a structured interaction can markedly affect the attitudes of

the individuals involved. Walter, using a pre-posttest format, attempted to measure the change over a period of seven months attitudes of new staff who participated in the summer faculty training program and of those who had not. These groups were further divided into subgroups of faculty who had deaf students in their classes compared with those who did not. When first tested in September, the faculty who had been in the Summer Program showed a much higher level of positive affect than did those who had not participated in the program. But when the tests were administered again in April, there was no significant carry-over of the effect of summer program involvement. The difference in levels of faculty affective response corresponded instead to degree of classroom contact. This change in faculty attitude seemed to focus particularly on the variables that related to assimilation of deaf students into hearing society and to their achievement in classes. This was regarded as a shift toward a more realistic attitude concerning the handicapping effects of deafness.

Stuckless' survey of faculty and student attitudes towards serving "special students" at RIT seemed to indicate a generally positive but realistically qualified attitude. Since this study was conducted at a time (1970-1971) several years after the first NTID students came to campus, its seems reasonable to assume that a significant part of the attitudes surveyed derive from a direct exposure to deaf students. Both faculty and student attitudes seemed to reflect a distant but positive regard for serving special students; that is, they attached greatest "value" to serving special students at RIT and expressed least "ease" about it. Both students and faculty registered their highest valence

with regard to the concept of offering special technical educational classes to disadvantaged students; although the faculty were least inclined to have special students in their regular classes, and were similarly less favorable toward having educationally disadvantaged students on campus at all. Both groups did register a positive attitude toward the general concept of special students on campus, but the strongest response was from those students who did not themselves live on campus.

These studies seem to indicate that RIT has had a generally positive attitude toward the deaf students, but that any extended contact with those students results in a marked shift downward in attitude a more realistic comprehension of the implied limitations of the students' handicap. This possibility was further noted by Riffer (1970) in his comparative study of a group of resident advisors and a group of student interpreters. Riffer found that the student interpreters, who had received a more extensive training in the problems of deafness and had a greater contact with the students, registered a more realistic attitude toward the NTID students.

The kind of context which would encourage positive attitudinal development in deaf-hearing confrontations is hinted at in some of Riffer's research. In a study of deaf friendship patterns (1970) Riffer indicated some of the particular circumstances in which friendships seemed likely to develop between deaf types and between deaf and hearing students.

The contextual structure of deaf-hearing confrontations seems to have some bearing on the outcome of the interaction. Within the time-span studied, the mere percentage of deaf students in a dorm area did not seem to influence the likelihood of deaf-hearing friendships. Likewise, attendance in class was not conducive to deaf-hearing friendships, although it seemed to promote friendships among some deaf types. Perhaps this was because the classroom support services and particularly the presence of the interpreter single the deaf students out as separate or different.

While the general structure of the residence hall context will probably influence the development of deaf-hearing confrontations, the most important single aspect of that structure is the staff who will implement or direct student activities. The influence of these staff members derives not only from their guidance and information-giving activities, but also from their position as "role models". After the first Summer Program concluded, Riffer (1971c) found that deaf students reported hearing students among their friends with 72% greater frequency than they did when living in distributed housing the previous year. The hearing students named by Summer Program students were almost exclusively resident advisors and interpreters.

The joint importance of having competent staff and appropriate structure was indicated by Riffer when he concluded that, "Apparently, the Summer Program enabled deaf students to become comfortable with hearing

students and thus prepared them for making new friendships when they were put into integrated housing." (Stuckless, 1971, p. 8)

Assimilation

Assimilation is that aspect of deaf-hearing social interaction in which persons of one type can mix more or less indistinguishably with persons of another type. The greatest extent to which this is likely to occur on a broad scale in between deaf types. At the conclusion of the first academic quarter of his study, Riffer (1971a) indicated that the only real extent to which this had occurred between deaf and hearing was in the case of those hearing persons skilled in manual communication and actively involved in working with NTID students (such as interpreters, some residence advisors, etc.) who had moved essentially into the deaf culture. Both Riffer and a number of the persons interviewed further indicated that there are a number of deaf students (usually those who label themselves "har-of-hearing") who prefer not to be identified as deaf and who choose the company of hearing students.

The importance of those individuals capable of assimilation is not that they represent any possible large-scale trend, but that they can serve as a positive influence on both the segregated deaf types and the segregated deaf and hearing students. It is through employing the talents and interests of such persons that NTID can help to assure the provision of an appropriate residential environment for the development of deaf-hearing social interactions.

Discussion

Insofar as this report is intended to inform policy or planning decisions, most of the literature initially reviewed concerning the integration of minority groups (mostly racial minorities) has not been included here. The equation of deaf isolation to the much discussed but little understood ethnic or racial problem, although often cited for descriptive reasons, has very little prescriptive merit. Most of the more considered reviews of the literature confess the inadequate and frequently contradictory nature of the information presently available in this area (St. John, 1970, 1970; Stein and Zasser, 1970; Zirkel, 1972).

The very word "integration" is misleading in that it neither prescribes nor describes in an appropriate way the deaf-hearing social interaction. There is no place in the public law or subsequent agreements establishing NTID wherein integration is mentioned. It is simply indicated that NTID shall serve as an integral part of RIT. For a majority of students entering NTID, integration in a hearing context is not an unprecedented experience, although for some an exposure to different deaf types may be a novel encounter.

As an integral part of RIT's institutional life, then, NTID should be concerned with maximizing the given potential of this institutional setting by inspiring the development of productive experiences and attitudes among the deaf-hearing student body. "The Institute should provide an environment in which students can achieve maturity, a sense

of social responsibility and a high degree of personal development by supplementing the educational program..." (NTID Policies, Guidelines and Application Procedures, 1966).

Properly speaking, integration means a merging of several parts such that the parts become indistinguishable from one another. Occasionally, the members of one student group may be largely assimilated into the culture of another group; this condition was indicated by the term "assimilation". Riffer (1973) suggested that assimilation could be a positive or a negative occurrence; it may derive from a genuine identification with the needs or attitudes of others, or it may be the product of identity confusion or unrealistic idealism.

The most widespread and prevailing deaf-hearing interaction was described as "confrontation." A deaf-hearing confrontation may develop into a genuine conflict, or it may result in an articulate accommodation between students. (The term "articulate" was used because "it implies as its result a perfect whole, but it differs from integrate in implying no loss of identity or distinctness of the things combined...." Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms). As an articulate interrelation, confrontation between student groups is probably the most common development; and as such it could be described as the mode of "desirable integration".

If student personal and social development were neglected or misdirected, the result would be the isolation of many students in the

deaf-hearing student body. The "discrimination" which underlies this isolation is, however, different from the discriminating affinities which generate peer group formation.

These various aspects of deaf-hearing social interrelations exist in a number of different dimensions. Any given student will have interpersonal associations among roommates, suitemates, housemates, floormates, and in the residence hall at large. It seems reasonable to expect that these different dimensions of his life will reflect various aspects of deaf-hearing social interaction. It would be a monumental and possibly fruitless task to attempt extensively to precondition or control the infinitely complex set of variables which would exist at these various levels of social activity. In order to eliminate the alienation of residents from one another and facilitate their adjustment to personal, social, and academic-vocational needs, the residence halls should be concerned with providing an environment which positively affects the basic attitudes of the residents. Many of the persons interviewed, and particularly those administrators and staff members who have worked directly with NTID students, agreed emphatically that dealing exclusively with the social segregation of students would overlook the need for prior attitudinal and personal development.

Information reviewed concerning deaf-hearing social interactions suggests that the best way to develop productive interrelations between students in the residential environment is through encouraging the maturation of personal, social and academic-vocational needs and interests. In so doing,

the NTID residence hall may hope to inspire among all students the felt need to communicate with and understand one another. Such needs will be generated within the residence hall peer process, and the institution may best expect to gain informative access to this area of student development through the use of responsive, trained staff in the residence halls.

RESIDENCE HALL STAFF

The Changing Role of the Staff

The evolution of the role of residence hall staff is a symptom of the changing way in which institutions of higher learning have viewed their responsibilities and intentions toward students. One consequence of earlier educational practices which viewed formal education as a discreet learning process was the separation of student living and learning experiences. As such, universities and residence halls in particular have often stood *in loco parentis* to their students. Housing served as a purely residual function in the educational system, its purpose being solely to contain the behavior of the students out-of-class and to provide shelter and food. The residence hall and residence staff acted as surrogate parents by controlling, directing, and punishing student behavior in whatever way was deemed necessary.

The sometimes arbitrary character of the *in loco parentis* role has been modified in recent years by the introduction of "due process" into student affairs. The resultant concept which increasingly has come to govern residence hall life is one which suggests "the implied power to enforce reasonable regulations" (Harms, 1970, p.1). This change in the formal conception of residence hall functions has accompanied significant restatements of the purpose and importance of student residential life.

Academic life and the formal learning process, once regarded by educators as being a discreet event in student life, are now seen to be an

integral part of student social and psychological development. Each area of student activity, whether formal or informal, is related to the overall learning process. In this light, Riker (1965) and others refer to the residence hall as a living-learning center. Of equal significance is the realization that the influence of student peer groups "has been found to have as much, if not more, impact on student attitudes than does the faculty or curriculum," (Brown, 1972, p. 197). The upshot of these realizations, in light of the fact that the larger portion of a student's time is spent out-of-class and often in the dormitory, is that the residence hall has come to be viewed as a very important part of the educational environment.

Student Personnel

As the perceived purpose of student residential life has changed, so has the function of residence hall staff. Generally one of the first changes in staff duties is the de-emphasis of their police function, as prescribed by the *in loco parentis* concept, in an effort to free them for involvement in more developmental tasks. One such effort at Alfred University delegated police and judicial functions to the students as part of their self-governance, thus allowing the resident advisor to act as an arbitrator or mediator and so involve himself more informally and with greater trust in resident life (Brown, 1969). This kind of effort can further serve to encourage the development of responsibility and self-determination among students (Greenleaf, 1966; Beder and Rickart, 1971).

Increasing awareness of the pervasive importance of peer processes in student life has encouraged the greater use of student personnel as residence hall staff.

> Actually the only real way for top administrators, faculty advisors and other college personnel to really get a feel for their particular campus and students is through the kind of grassroots contact... that is available to residence hall staffs, especially student assistants. Student assistants know more about how other students perceive the campus, education and society than any other professional on the campus. The awareness of and understanding of various students groups, as well as individual students, can be facilitated with the linkage furnished by well-trained student assistants. (Plough, 1972, p.9).

The principal role for which student assistants or resident advisors have been trained in recent years is that of peer counseling (Murry, 1972). A thirty hour training schedule was established by one college to train peer counselors, and the reported success of this program (Pyle and Snyder, 1971) was taken as an indication that trained lay students could serve effectively as peer counselors. A similar and more adequately evaluated effort was the six-week training course in "accurate empathy" described by Mitchell, Rubin, Bozard and Wyrick (1971). Tested on a nine point "Accurate Empathy Scale," the trained resident advisors appeared more effective as counselors than a similar untrained group. In addition to initial training, some effort has been given to establishing ongoing training programs. Meyer (1969) described a program of 1 to 1-1/2 hour weekly developmental group sessions for resident counselors which were co-directed by male and female professional counselors.

One function for which residence hall staff could be beneficially trained is that of programming or coordinating student activities (Riker, 1965; Powell, Pyler, Dickson, and McClellan, 1969). This function has been

largely neglected in the literature to date, and one of the few visible efforts in this direction has been the Programmed Housing offered to NTID students. A principal difficulty encountered in the programmed houses has been the generalization of resident interests beyond the limits of house friendships and activities.

> ...some of the frustrations which residence hall staff members encounter stem from unsuccessful attempts to organize social programs on the basis of one hall....Usually subcultures tend to cut across residence hall and corridor populations for their membership. (Plough, 1971, p.8).

Another function which residence hall staff may serve is that of role models. Research at NTID has indicated that this may be of particular relevance among a deaf student populous. Riffer (1971b) found that the attitudes of incoming NTID students tended to become more like the attitudes of their resident advisors over a six-month period.

One issue implicit in the variety of resident advisor training programs is the question of how much training is necessary to equip student personnel for their appropriate residence hall functions. Programs vary from several semesters of exposure to behavioral science theories and techniques - (Jackson, 1966) to programs lasting several weeks. It seems reasonable to suggest that the efficacy of training will relate to the accuracy with which residence staff are selected. Some programs have entailed a pre-selection training during which students either opt out or are selected out before the regular training begins (Carrenti and Tuttle, 1972).

On the whole, there have been very few viable and scientific evaluations of the effectiveness of residence staff and their training; the few efforts available in the literature have have reported exclusively in psychological journals (Berensen, Carkhuff and Myrus, 1966; Carkhuff, 1968, 1969; Martin and Carkhuff, 1968). Some recent articles have recommended that evaluation would be facilitated by designing resident advisor programs according to organizational theory (McDaniel, 1972) or "management by objectives" theory (Fischer and Howell, 1971; Hart, 1973). Such definition of objectives does seem to conduce to clarity of purpose and some greater ease of self-evaluation, but to date it has produced few hard-fact evaluations.

Residence hall staffing is a relatively new and often minor consideration in the field of educational theory and practice. With few exceptions (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969, Chickering, 1969), a comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach to defining, evaluating and implementing residence hall staff purposes and functions has not been apparent in the literature. As such, most of the information dealing with residence hall staffing is suggestive but not clearly prescriptive. What <u>is</u> suggested is that if the residence hall is to serve as a living-learning center, it can best do so through the efforts of student personnel adequately prepared to capitalize on the peer process through meeting student needs as they are felt and expressed.

Meeting Student Needs

The extent to which student needs are being adequately expressed and met at NTID has recently been indicated by research sampling student

opinions about residence hall life and staffing (Weegar, 1973). Using samples of student evaluations of resident advisors, a survey questionnaire of student opinion, and interviews, Weegar has suggested that eagerness on the part of NTID students to be involved in a more stimulating environment is not presently being purposefully and objectively utilized.

The resident advisor was perceived by NTID students as being mainly responsible for administrative, enforcement, and maintenance functions, with a corollary responsibility to provide some counseling. Other non-residents (faculty-staff members), were perceived as having a minimal supportive role in student dorm life, namely provision of some tutoring and counseling services. Although students indicated a general level of satisfaction with the role of the resident advisor, their perception of his role suggests that the place of the R.A. in residence hall life is more insignificant than satisfactory. Students did indicate a desire for resident advisors with greater training in communication and problems of deafness, and likewise for greater faculty-student contact in dormitory activities.

Student self-perceptions indicated a strong sense of self-determination insofar as they expressed the desire to be largely responsible for programming functions and tutoring, and a willingness to share equally in the maintenance function of the resident advisor. "Every study of student opinion in recent years points to the fact that students want to play a larger role in shaping and managing their college lives." (Student Housing, 1972, p. 13).

Although they had indicated a desire for increased student-faculty contact in the dorms, students further indicated that they did not want any adults living in the dorms. Furthermore, students preferred mixed, open housing arrangements (deaf-hearing houses, coeducational houses, club houses) to the more controlled housing arrangements (honors house, programmed house, freshmen house, homogeneous major house, all deaf house).

These perceptions contrast strikingly with some of the opinions expressed by administrators, researchers and staff members interviewed. The persons interviewed generally agreed on the desirability of having adults living in the dorms, on having some homogeneous or controlled housing arrangements, and on the role of the resident advisor as counselor, advisor, and programmer. Opinions expressed in the interviews did agree with student desires to have greater faculty-student contact, increased student responsibility and self-determination, and more training for dormitory staff in communication and problems of deafness.

These findings serve to suggest that residents and university personnel have a similar desire to move toward a more responsible living-learning residence hall environment. They disagree on the respective roles of students and personnel in determining or directing student life toward that end.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

In keeping with the extensive re-orientation of college life and education during recent years, college facilities have tended to express a broader range of needs and ideals. The NTID residence hall facilities are, perhaps, more unique than most because they are being designed to accommodate a deaf-hearing, living-learning environment.

A review of the literature concerning the impact of the physical environment on dormitory residents would seem to suggest that the general design of the NTID residence hall facilities conforms in many respects to the general outlines of a living-learning environment as described by Riker (1965) and Clarcq (1967, 1971).

Much of the information describing other attempts at various colleges and universities to design an appropriate living-learning residential environment has been only slightly informative. The numerous descriptive or prescriptive statements (Riker, 1965; Alfert, 1968; Rohringer, 1970; Brown, 1972; College Housing, 1972), generally aim at suggesting, a) that choice in expressing life style is as important as the structure of the residence hall in predicting student satisfaction, and b) a living-learning program will probably require particular facilities to accommodate its purpose. Studies which attempted to test or predict the effect of the physical environment on residents were generally inconclusive (Titus, 1972; Avery, 1971) or dealt with questionable criteria (Sinnette and Sachson, 1973).

The basis for a lack of clarity in this literature is a comparatively primitive state of knowledge concerning the psychological-behavioral effects of a physical environment on people. Most of the studies in this area fail to take into consideration a number of important qualifications: 1) unmeasured personal characteristics, 2) the extent to which personality influences the use of space as well as how space influences personality, 3) the extent to which reactions to a physical environment may be learned.

In an intelligent and comprehensive review of the literature, Drew (1971) summarized the research into two general areas of effect: color and space. It is interesting to note that even the more general and acceptable conclusions in this field of knowledge can contradict the specific needs of the NTID dormitory.

Color influences movement and mode (activity, relaxation). The effect of light is to excite, the effect of dark is to subdue. Several studies suggested that visual contact with the outside world (i.e. windows in a classroom) is very important to effective homeostasis, and in turn, mental productivity. Yet it is interesting to note that windows are not present in the NTID dormitory classrooms in order to facilitate the visibility of manual communication. Spacial arrangements are thought to have an effect on the kind and quality of interaction that takes place in an area, and such arrangements have been used to manipulate group composition and stability (small spaces conduce to static group composition, while larger, more active, public spaces conduce to more mobile group behaviors or make-up). Several studies suggested that a

circular or semi-circular arrangement was not particularly conducive to group discussion, yet it is this arrangement which is most necessary to facilitate manual communication.

Drew suggests that the inconclusiveness of studies concerning the psychological-behavioral effects of physical environment might imply that the influences under consideration were so fragile as to be inconsequential in the real world. However, since the principle mode of communication among deaf students is the visual mode, it seems likely that the qualities of physical environment may be more effectively communicated to the deaf student than they would be to the hearing student.

If there is any concensus of opinion to be found in the literature treating residential physical facilities, it may be summarized in three points: 1) spacial and color arrangements can create or compliment certain environmental settings; 2) freedom of expression or choice in life style is as important to the guarantee of student satisfaction as the actual character or type of facility; and 3) a living-learning residential program will probably need particular facilities to accommodate its purposes.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION

"We don't grow apples; they grow by themselves, and perhaps we can help."

--Anonymous

Student Life in a Residence Hall

There has been a growing interest among educators about how the conditions of residence hall life may be capitalized upon to enhance students' college experiences. Until quite recently, the majority of research in this field involved the manipulation or preconditioning of peer group formation. Such research has confirmed the existence of some of the functions of the peer process in student life, but there has been no conclusive evidence that consistently positive results may be obtained by interfering with the conditions or elements of student interaction.

The modest success attained by manipulating student peer groups can be partly attributed to unsophisticated testing procedures and a dearth of experimental work. It seems just as likely, however, that the very nature of these efforts is somewhat self-defeating, for by interfering with the self-selection of peers into their perceived appropriate groups, the researcher is subjecting himself to a high probability of error. Self-selection appears to be a most significant variable in peer group formation. Just as choice through self-selection plays a key role in the socialization of students, so it is choice again which underlies the self-determining process of "identity" development which psychology describes as a critical milestone in students' passage through adolescence.

In the course of shifting through different and often divergent self-perceptions, students will exhibit regular and seemingly inappropriate changes in their life style. The notion of a residence hall serving *in loco parentis* was a traditional misconception of how to cope with the improprieties of student life.

Manipulation can inhibit the self-selective aspect of the peer process, and excessive regulation can inhibit the development of identity among students. It seems quite probable that arbitrary control of student life, whether in the name of propriety or of developmental theory, can effectively obstruct the experimentation in interpersonal relationships and style of living which is necessary to a student's movement away from parental (and institutional) dependence toward a responsible definition of his personal goals and his relation to others around him.

The need for support rather than constraint of self-determination is particularly evident among students at NTID. Many students need to identify themselves and their place among others due to a sense of isolation or personal confusion. The uncertain place of the NTID student in the hearing world as well as the probable discontinuity between his personal background and his college life may further isolate him from his peers and confuse his attempt to identify with his handicap. The development of a positive deaf-hearing interaction is one of the more significant and most visible issues at stake in the successful student life of NTID.

The potential of the residence hall for mitigating the isolation of students from one another derives from its capacity to contribute to and to encompass most of the formal and informal extracurricular activities of students. Since student residence life is largely a self-deterministic peer process, the contribution of the dorm to student life will vary with the extent to which residential programs and staff functions are either integrated into or imposed upon the peer process. In many ways the residence hall staff provide a common ground between the needs of the institution and the needs of students.

The Residence Hall in Student Life

To a certain extent a residence hall environment implies an institutionalization of the peer process: relationships are structured through room arrangements, house governance and activities, student roles and responsibilities. This general framework can play a directive and controling role in student life or it can serve as a contributing and influential part of the peer process. Recent educational practices have tended to emphasize the latter possibility.

Educators' appreciation of student life as an integral peer culture has been matched by a growing awareness that learning is more than a formal process; that social, psychological and educational activities form a single experiential mode of student development. The use of student personnel in residence halls is intended to relate institutional functions to the peer process in a more responsive way; likewise, the development of residence halls as "living-learning centers" is intended to relate educational goals to student life in a more realistic way.

A principal emphasis of the living-learning environment is the integration of curricular and extracurricular activities. Although this has not proven to have a notable effect on students' academic achievement, it does appear to have contributed to the stability and perceived satisfaction of their college experiences. Lofland (1969) stated that the continuity of a student's "place round" (i.e. his surroundings, his various spheres of activity) may determine the stability of his lifestyle; and Feldman (1972) explicitly proposed that such continuity accounts for the success of cluster colleges.

The concept of a living-learning environment suggests some interesting possibilities for the development of a favorable deaf-hearing milieu in residence halls. A living-learning situation implies a more integrated life-style, and hence, the development of a more integral peer process with an emphasis on common attitudes. Insofar as the foundation of a positive deaf-hearing interaction is a set of common attitudes arising from the peer culture, a living-learning environment would probably serve to enhance the assimilation of deaf and hearing students into a common peer culture.

The attitudes which can bring deaf and hearing students into a more positive relationship are those which arise from the students' need to better communicate to one another their shared experience of changing ideals and perceptions. Trained student personnel, by relating the resources of the institution to these student needs can help to realize the potential of the residence hall for encouraging and contributing to the college experience of students.

Developing Student Residence Hall Life

The institution which chooses to move toward developing a living-learning environment in the residence hall will necessarily reflect and impact upon the total educational process of the institution itself. This is one of the most significant and fruitful implications of the living-learning concept.

In many ways a living-learning residence hall is a kind of educational clearing house. In such an environment, the creation of a balance between various alternatives in residential life might raise some interesting questions.

1) What is the extent of academic input into residence hall life? Perhaps some curricular restructuring would be necessary in order to better integrate the formal and informal learning needs of students. Perhaps facilities could be provided in which student interest groups might live and work together; and possibly the activities of a Free University could be more closely incorporated into the residence hall. The academic interests of students should be properly equated with their personal and recreational interests; and the desirability of adult role models and faculty resources in the dorms should be weighed against the growing privatistic inclinations of students.

2) If physical education is to be a part of students' educational experiences, does this imply a de-emphasis of the traditional and more exclusive team sports? Perhaps a closer and more instructive relationship between the residence hall and the physical education department would make it possible for students to share more generally in the poise and self-confidence which group recreational and competitive activities can provide.

3) Does an increase in student responsibility toward the institution and themselves call for a reallocation of professional and administrative responsibilities? If the residence hall is to serve as a transition from dependent to independent life, it may come to serve less as a room-and-board facility as students provide more of these needs for themselves. Perhaps a greater clarification of the contribution which professionals can make to student development would relieve the institution of certain administrative and custodial responsibilities.

The development of a living-learning residential environment is clearly not an overnight or single-decision task. The institution as well as the student would require a long-term process of adaptation and reorganization, and this probably calls for a phased or progressive planning effort. Certain educational, administrative, and financial commitments accrued through past policies would require attention, and student and institutional life must be reasonably directed toward new commitments. In short a living-learning environment is not an established condition but a

balanced process which must be realized over time. Within this process the residence hall can come to serve as an artifice in which student life and choice is tempered by a balanced measure of freedom and responsibility.

REFERENCES

Alberti, A.E. Influence of the Faculty on College Student Development. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 1, 18-23.

Alfert, E. Developmental Stage and Choice of Residence in College. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 3, 90-93.

Altschuler, K.Z. (Ed.) Mental Health and the Deaf: Approaches and Prospects. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969.

Astin, A.W. Differential College Effects on the Motivation of Talented Students to Obtain the Ph.D. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1963, 54, 63-71.

Astin, H.S. Educational Progress of Disadvantaged Students. Paper presented to the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington: Human Service Press, 1970.

Austin, C.G. (EB) The Conference on the Cluster College Concept. Journal of Higher Education, 1967, 38, 357-397.

Avery, M.C., Davis, G., and Rozien, R. Architectural Determinants of Student Satisfaction in College Residence Halls. Washington, D.C.: HEW, 1971.

Beal, P.E. and Williams, B.A. An Experiment With Mixed-Class Housing Assignments at the University of Oregon. Student Housing Research, ACUHO Research and Information Committee, February, 1968.

Beder, H.W. and Rickart, S.T. Residence Hall Regulations and Staff Roles: A Substitute Model for in loco parentis. NASPA Journal, 1971, 9(1), 57-61.

Berensen, B.G., Carkhuff, R.R. and Myrus, P. The Interpersonal Functioning and Training of College Students. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1966, 13, 441-446.

Brown, R.B. Manipulation of the Environmental Press in a College Residence Hall. Personnel and Guidance Journal, February, 1968, 555-560.

Brown, R.B. Resident Adviser Programming. NASPA Journal, 1969, 7 (2), 86-90.

Brown, R.B. Student Development in an Experimental College or I May Have Seen a Unicorn. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13 (3) 196-201.

Brown, R.D., Winkworth, J. and Baskamp, L. Student Development in a Co-ed Residence Hall: Promiscuity, Prophylactic, or Panacea? Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14(2), 98-104.

Carkhuff, R.R. Differential Functioning of Lay and Professional Helpers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 117-126.

Carkhuff, R.R. Critical Variables in Effective Counselor Training. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1969, 16, 238-245.

Centra, J.A. Student Perceptions of Residence Hall Environments: Living-Learning vs. Conventional Units. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 4, 266-272.

Centra, J.A. Black Students at Predominately White Colleges: A Research Description. College Entrance Examination Board, Research Bulletin No. RB-70-19, March, 1970.

Chickering, A.W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Chickering, A.W. Cultural Sophistication and the College Experience. Project on Student Development in Small Colleges, Research Report, 1970.

Chickering, A.W. To Them That Had, Was Given, From Them That Had Not, Was Taken Away. Project on Student Development in Small Colleges, Interim Report, February 11, 1971.

Chickering, A.W. and McCormick, J. Personality Development and the College Experience. Project on Student Development in Small Colleges, Research Report, 1970.

Clarcq, J.R. Perceptions of Students and Staff Relating to the Purposes of Undergraduate Residence Halls on Selected Public College Campuses on New York State. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Syracuse University, 1967.

Clarcq, J.R. The Educational Impact of Residence Halls. Improving College and University Teaching, 18(1), 1970, 44-45.

Coleman, J.C. Abnormal Psychology and Modern Life. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Forestman and Company, 1964.

Coleman, J.C. Et. Al. The Quality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Corbett, J. and Sommer, R. Anatomy of a Co-ed Residence Hall. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 215-217.

Craig, W.N., Newman, J.N., and Burrows, N.L. An Experiment in Post-Secondary Education for Deaf People, American Annals of the Deaf, Dec., 1972, 606-611.

Crain, R.L. School Integration and Occupational Achievement of Negros. American Journal of Sociology, 1970, 75, 593-606.

Crew, J.L. and Giblette, J.F. Academic Performance of Freshman as a Function of Residence Hall Housing. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1965, 6, 167-170.

Davison, M.B. Educational Outcomes and Implications of Academically and Vocationally Focused Small Groups of Undergraduate Students in a Women's Residence Hall. Paper read at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, Minneapolis, April, 1965.

DeCoster, V.A. Housing Assignments for High Ability Students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 19-22.

DeCoster, V.A. Effects of Homogeneous Housing Assignments for High Ability Students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9, 75-78.

DiFrancesa, S.J. and Hurwitz, S.N. Rehabilitation of Hard-Core Deaf: Identification of an Affective Style. Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf, 1969, 3(2).

Dressel, P.L. (ED) The New Colleges: Toward an Appraisal, ACT Monograph No. 7, Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1971.

Drew, C.J. Research on the Psychological-Behavioral Effects of the Physical Environment. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41(5), 447-465.

Elton, C.F. and Bate, W.S. The Effect of Housing Policy on Grade Point Average. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 7, 73-77.

Feinberg, L. Faculty-Student Interaction: How Students Differ. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 1, 24-27.

Feldman, K.A. Some Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Change and Stability of College Students. Review of Educational Research, 1972. A, 42, 1-26.

Feldman, K.A. Some Common and Not So Common Approaches to the Study of College Environments and Their Effects. Paper read at annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, 1972 B.

Fisher, M.B. and Howell, J.A. Evaluation and Accountability. NCPA, 10(2), 118-123.

Gehring, D.D. Prediction of Roommate Compatibility. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 58-61.

Gerst, M.S. and Moos, R.H. The Social Ecology of University Student Residences. Paper presented to the National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland, 1971.

Gordon, J.H. Value Differences Between Freshman and Seniors at a State University. College Student Survey, 1967, 92(1).

Greenleaf, E.A. Residence Halls, 1970's. NASPA Journal 1960, 7 (2), 65-71.

Greenleaf, E.A. Co-educational Residence Halls: An Evaluation. Journal of the National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors, 1962, 25, 106-111.

Hall, R.L. and Willerman, B. The Educational Influence of Dormitory Roommates. Sociometry, 1963, 26, 294-318.

Harms, H.E. The Concept of in loco parentis in Higher Education. Unpublished manuscript, Florida University Institute of Higher Education, Cainesville, Fla., 1970.

Hart, D. Applying Management by Objectives to a Residence Hall Program. Paper submitted to ACPA Annual Convention, April, 1973, Cleveland, Ohio.

Hartshorne, E.Y. Undergraduate Society and the College Culture. American Sociological Review, 1963, 8.

Holland, J.A. and Richards, J.N. Academic and Non-Academic Accomplishment: Correlated or Uncorrelated? Journal of Educational Psychology, 1965, 56, 165-174.

Homans, G.C. The Human Group. New York: Hartcort, Brace, 1950.

Huntley, C.W. Changes in Study of Value Scores During the 4 Years of College. Genetic Psychology Monograph, 1965, 71, 349-383.

Isaacs, M. Attitudes Towards the College Deaf Student: Stereotype or "Kernel of Truth"? Unpublished Research Manuscript, Rochester Institute of Technology, 1972.

Jackson, R.E.A. Development of Dormitory Staff as Sub-Professional Counselors, research report, North Dakota University, Grand Forks, N.D., 1966.

Johnston, S. A Comparison of E ronmental Perceptions of Student Sub-groups in Residence Halls. Unpublished Research Report, Missouri University, 1971.

Katz, E. Review of Evidence Relating to the Effects of Desegration on the Intellectual Performance of Negros. American Psychologist, 1964, 19, 381-399.

Katz, E. Academic Motivation and Educational Opportunity. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 57-65.

Korn, H.A. Higher Education Programs and Student Development. Review of Educational Research, 1969, 30, 155-172.

Ladd, D.R. Change in Educational Policy: Self-Studies in Selected Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Lehman, I.L. and Dressel, P.L. Critical Thinking, Attitudes, and Values in Higher Education. Cooperative Research Project No. 590 (HEW), 1962.

Lofland, J. Deviance and Identity, Englewood Clifts, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Maissonneuve, J.A., Palmade, G. and Fourment, C. Selective Choices and Propinquity. Sociometry, 1952, 15, 135-140.

Martin, J.C. and Carkhuff, R.R. The effects of Training upon Trainee Personality and Behavior, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1968, 24, 109-110.

McConnell, T.R. and Heist, P. The Diverse College Student Population. In Sanford, N. (Ed.) The American College, New York: Reiley & Sons, 1967.

McDaniel, R.R. Organization Theory and Preparation of Student Personnel Workers. NASPA Journal, 1972, 10(2), 101-105.

Meyer, D.E. A Study of Student-Faculty Relationships at the College Level. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Meyer, M. Technique and Facilititation of Developmental Groups, paper presented to ACPA Convention, 1969.

Mitchell, K.M., Rubin S.E., Bozard, J.P. and Wyrick. T.J. Effects of Short term Training on Residence Hall Assistants. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1971, 10(4), 310-318.

Morishima, J.K. Effects on Student Achievement on Residence Hall Groupings Based on Academic Majors. In Bagley, C.H. (Ed.) Research on Academic Input: Proceedings of the 6th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Cortland, New York: Office of Institutional Planning, State University of New York and Cortland, 1966.

Murphy, R. and Ortenzi, A. Use of Standardized Measurements in the Selection of Residence Hall Staff. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1966, 8(6), 360-363.

Newcomb, P.M. Student Peer Group Influence. In Sanford, N. (Ed.) The American College: Wiley and Sons, 1967.

Newcomb, T.M. and Feldman, K.A. The Impact of College Students, Vol. 1, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Ogden, G.B. Some Consequences of an Innovative Living-Learning Program. Paper presented to Annual Meeting of New England Educational Research Organization, Boston College, 1971.

Pace, L.T. Roommate Dissatisfaction in Residence Halls. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 144-147.

Pemberton, C.S. An Evaluation of the 1967-1968 Living-Learning Experiment at the University of Delaware. University Impact Study, Delaware: University of Delaware, 1968.

Plough, T. Understanding Student Subcultures, paper presented at CMU workshop, August 19, 1969.

Powell, J.R., Plyler, S.A., Dickson, B.A. and McLellan, S.D., The Personnel Assistant in College Residence Halls. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

Pyle, R.R. and Snyder, F.A. Students as Paraprofessional Counselors at Community Colleges. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12(4), 259-262.

Riffer, R.L. Feedback About the Summer Interpreter Training Program paper submitted to the NTID Division of Research, Sept. 1970a.

Riffer, R.L. Abstract of speech at A.G. Bell Conference. Philadelphia, June 26, 1970b.

Riffer, R.L. Social Patterns of Deaf People in Integrated Programs. Report of the Proceedings of the 45th Meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, Little Rock, Arkansas, 1971a, 330-333.

Riffer, R.L. Student Social Development at NTID. Paper presented to NTID Division of Research and Training, 1971b.

Riffer, R.L. Determinants of the Sociometric Patterns Among Deaf and Hearing Students at NTID. Paper presented to NTID Division of Research and Development, 1971c.

Riker, H.C. Planning Functional College Housing. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Riker, H.C. College Housing as Learning Centers. ACPA Report, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Rockey, N.C. Living and Learning at Central Washington State College. Paper presented at NDEA Institute for College Student Personnel Workers, Michigan State University, 1969.

Rohringer, L. Style of living means more than style of building. College and University Business, 1970, 50 (4), 50-52.

Rusalem, H. A Study of College Students Attitudes about Deafness and Blindness. New Outlook for the Blind, 1956, 59, 90-91.

St. John, M.H. Desegration and Minority Group Performance. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 1, 111-133.

Schoemer, J.R. and McConnell, W.A. Is There a Case for the Freshman Women's Residence Hall? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1970, 49, 35-40.

Schroeder, C.C., and Lemay, M.L. The Impact of Co-ed Residence Halls on Self-Actualization. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 105-110.

Severinsen, K.N., Viviano, A., and Hopkins, G., Effect of Over Assignment to Residence Hall Rooms. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 141-143.

Shaw, W.B. Communitizing a Residence Hall: One Strategy. Unpublished address, University of Denver, 1972.

Siegel, A.E. and Siegel, S. Reference Groups, Membership Groups, and Attitude Change. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 1957, 55, 35-40.

Sinnette E. R., Sachson, A.D. and Eddy, G. The Influence of Living Units on the Behavior of College Students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 3, 209-214.

Stein, Z. and Zusser, M. Mutibility of Intelligence and Epidemeology of Mild Mental Retardation. Review of Educational Research, 1970, 40, 59-67.

Stern, G. Of Bardot and the State of our Colleges. Current Issues in Higher Education: 1966, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966.

Sternberg, C. Personality Trait Patterns of College Students Majoring in Different Fields. Psychological Monograms, 1955, 69, 18-26.

Stuckless, E.R. Research on the Social Adjustment of NTID Students. Paper prepared for NTID Focus, 1971.

Stuckless, E.R. A Study of Faculty and Student Perceptions Towards Serving Special Students at RIT. Unpublished Research Report, NTID, 1972.

Student Housing, A Report from Educational Facilities Laboratory, Library of Congress, Catalog No. 72-87894, 1972.

Student Housing: A Report to the Statutory Commission, Madison, Wisconsin, April, 1971.

Taylor, R.G. Effects of Living Environment on Achievement and Study Habits. Paper presented to ACPA Convention, St. Louis, March, 1970.

Teevan, F.C. Personality Correlates of Undergraduate Field of Specialization. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1954, 18, 212-214.

Titus, C.R. Student Express Their Housing Needs and Preferences. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 3, 202-204.

Vreeland, R. The Effect of Houses on Students Attitudes and Values. Whiteley, J.M. and Sprandel, H.Z. (EDS) The Growth and Development of College Students, American College Student Personnel Association, Student Personnel Series No. 12, 1970.

Wallace, W.L. Student Culture. Chicago: Aldine, 1966.

Walter, G.G. A Study of Faculty Attitudes Toward NTID and Related Concepts. Unpublished research report, NTID, 1969.

Walter, G.G. and Berdy, S.M. Profile of Students Entering NTID in 1970. NTID Research Report (HEW), 1971.

Warr, P.V. Attitudes and Behavior in a Hall Residence. University Quarterly, 1964, 19, 56-68.

Webster, H. Changes in Attitudes in College. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 109-117.

Whittaker, B. Student Sub-cultures Reviewed and Revisited. Journal of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1969, 1, 23-24.

Zirkel, P.A. Self-Concept and the Disadvantage of Ethnic Group Membership and Mixture. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 211-226.